HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 44 Saturday, October 29, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Lausche: Senator Richard Russell (D., Ga.) startled the Capital this week by recommending Governor Frank J. Lausche of Ohio as a "middle-of-the-road" candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. After some investigation, HUMAN EVENTS believes that the Russell announcement has been under consideration for some time and is the result of no little consultation among Southern conservative Democratic Senators.

The suggestion was also made, it is believed, with full knowledge that it will be extremely difficult to nominate Lausche against the certain opposition of the labor bosses. The Southern Senators, it is said, find Harriman and Stevenson unsatisfactory, fear the rise of labor unions in the South and are desperately staking their hopes on Lausche (who, it is widely believed in Ohio, actually voted for Taft in the latter's re-election campaign of 1950). Finally, it may be recalled that HUMAN EVENTS on January 8, 1955, exclusively reported that Carmine DeSapio, New York Democratic boss, sounded out a meeting of Democratic figures in behalf of the Lausche candidature.

The announcement has caused no little brooding speculation among veteran political experts. One point of amazed comment is — this is the first time in history that a Southern Democratic leader, who surely knows full well what Southern constituents will take, has publicly said that he would like to have a Catholic as President. This startling contrast with the situation in 1928 when the South split over the candidacy of another Catholic, Governor Al Smith, is instructive. Secondly, this is the first time since the rise of Franklin D. Roosevelt that any Northern Democrat of national timber who is regarded as a conservative among Democrats has been urged as a candidate for the nomination.

The latter consideration prompts observers here to draw the inference that the rise of Lausche is symptomatic of the increasing trend towards conservatism in the Free World (see this week's Article Section, "Conservatives, Wake Up and Win, I", by James L. Wick) and especially in America. If Lausche definitely seeks the nomination, he will draw in his train that long neglected segment of the electorate, the Northern conservative Democrats, not to mention many Republicans who followed Senator Taft. His campaign might well serve to swing the Republican candidates to the Right, even in the case of, and perhaps because of, the successful opposition of the labor bosses to the Ohioan in the Democratic convention. The demand for Lausche may prove to be of great, although at present imponderable, effect on the political picture of the next year.

Inside The State Department: No official in "interregnum" Washington has taken the bit in his teeth more happily than Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. He returned from Denver last week enheartened by the President's last words as he entrusted Dulles with full powers to act at the Geneva foreign ministers conference. "You have carte blanche, Foster," reportedly said the President. Senators who talked with Dulles before he set forth for Europe express belief that the Secretary will not be taken in by any of the famous smiles of the Russian delegation.

Along diplomatic row in Washington, it is said that Dulles now wields undisputed sway over foreign policy; and that he now enjoys freedom from the formerly hampering activities of what has become known as the "other State Department." This term has been applied to the group — composed of Milton Eisenhower, Paul Hoffman, Nelson Rockefeller, Harold Stassen — who have surrounded the President and have the reputation of urging him to appease Moscow. HUMAN EVENTS on August 13 reported that Dulles found himself crossed up by this group in his dealings with the Indian pro-Soviet diplomat, Krishna Menon. Dulles brushed off Menon, who wanted

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an interview with the President. But, Menon got the interview through the intercession of Paul Hoffman, much to the displeasure of Dulles.

In the past week, the picture of a frustrated Dulles has disappeared. For, when Krishna Menon called on him again, Dulles received the aide-de-camp of Nehru very frigidly. When the Indian envoy sought to impress Dulles with threats that the Chinese Reds might start shooting again unless the U.S. agreed to meet with the heads of the Chinese Red regime, the Secretary rose to his feet and virtually showed Menon the door. Next day — the story goes — Dr. Milton Eisenhower phoned Mr. Dulles, asking him to see Menon again. The Secretary of State illustrated who was boss of foreign policy when he politely but firmly replied in the negative.

Ohio Referendum On Reuther: A crucial battle has started in Ohio where a referendum* on Reuther's supplemental unemployment benefits will be submitted to the voters of that state on November 8.

The fight really started when the United Auto Workers got from Ford last June — and then from scores of other employers — an agreement for supplementary unemployment compensation with payments that would bring the combined income during layoffs (usually with a 26 week time limit) to 60 or 65 per cent of the weekly wage. This was the result of the Guaranteed Annual Wage victory of Reuther. The qualifying clause in many contracts provides that such payments as additions to unemployment benefits must be certified as legal by states employing two-thirds of the employer's UAW members. In the case of Ford, its plants in Michigan, New York and Ohio employ the necessary two-thirds.

When the contracts were signed, authorities were almost unanimous that permissive legislation would be required in all major industrial states. But the Administrations of New York and Michigan caved in under CIO pressure and declared such payments legal without legislative action.

In Ohio, however, both the state unemployment compensation agency and the attorney-general refused to make the desired ruling. Thereupon, the CIO sought legislation not only approving supplemental payments, but increasing maximum unemployment compensation from $30 for 26 weeks to $59 for 39 weeks and raising the permitted percentage of weekly wages to 60 per cent.

Governor Lausche, a conservative Democrat, opposed the proposal as "fantastic" and the legislature refused to act at the point of a pistol. Thereupon, the CIO got enough signatures to put the bill to a state-wide vote.

If — as the referendum bill provides — the state should pay 60 per cent for 39 weeks, employers like Ford who have agreed to pay 65 per cent would have to pay only 5 per cent; but Reuther has made no secret of the fact that such a condition would be temporary. His goal is 100 per cent of take-home for all idle workers: first for a 52 week period, then for two years — if not indefinitely!

Reuther scorns the massive evidence that hundreds of thousands of persons now prefer idleness pay — low as it is — to working for wages. He also ignores the fact that the industrious — in their taxes — will have to support the very large number who would disdain useful employment if benefits rise much higher than the present amounts.

Another vital feature in Reuther's Ohio proposal is that it would permit no supplementation except by those who receive "payment by an employer by reason of a guaranteed annual pay plan." In other words, this special privilege would be given only to those who belong to unions.

An organization called the Ohio Information Committee has been set up to fight the proposal, but received little in contributions from employers until mid-September, when it became certain the bill would go on the ballots. That left only eight weeks in which to raise funds as well as to make plans and prepare the argumentation. The material prepared by the unions was already coming off the presses in September. Union stewards were already indoctrinating the workers.

Pessimistic Ohioans cite this as one more unfortunate example of the excessive caution of industrialists in political matters. "Always too little and too late!" They recall the full page ads against

*Technically, the Ohio question is submitted to voters as an "initiative."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Guaranteed Annual Wage, which the National Association of Manufacturers published — on the day the Ford contract was signed! And this, despite the fact that far ahead of time Reuther had raised a strike fund of $25,000,000 and announced that he was going to "get GAW — or else."

Education Front: First advance guard clashes on the issue of Federal aid to education — to be discussed at the White House conference on December 1 — have begun to occur. Mrs. Eugene Meyer (wife of the publisher of the "liberal" *Washington Post*) tossed a bomb into an Arizona education convention on October 21. She asserted that the Eisenhower Administration had sold out Federal educational aid to the "budget balancers" and that the coming White House conference was "stacked" with people influenced by this economy point of view.

Washington observers believe that this "stacking" has not taken place, that — quite to the contrary — the conference will be filled with those who have been indoctrinated with views favorable to Federal aid. Mrs. Meyer's blast (she is known in Washington as an "extremist voice") is said to be a frantic attempt to stiffen Federal aid supporters with a stronger "liberal" line. It is believed here that increasing grass-roots sentiment against Federal aid and wide journalistic debunking of extravagant estimates of school needs has intimidated a number of "liberals."

Quite a different picture from that presented by Mrs. Meyer is given in an article on the subject by Mary Mitchell, published in the October number of *Free Men Speak* (7314 Zimple St., New Orleans 18, La.). The author shows links between many of the members of the Committee for the White House conference and five organizations working for the socialistic concept of education — UNESCO, NEA, National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools, American Assembly, Ford Foundation Funds. A chart of the interlocking interests of those involved in the White House conference illustrates the thesis of the author.

Letter from J. C. GIBSON, Vice President and General Counsel of the Atchison, Topeka and Sante Fe Railway System: "I find HUMAN EVENTS informative and stimulating and wish you the best of luck in your fight for sane and sound public policies."

MacArthur: General MacArthur denies that at the time of Yalta he wanted Russia to enter the Far Eastern war; that, on the contrary, he would have at that time counselled the War Department not to make a deal bringing Russia in, if his opinion had been asked. The Defense Department — in the documents issued on the current controversy — shows that MacArthur early in the Pacific war wanted Russia to come in, but produces no documents from MacArthur at the time of Yalta urging any such course.

Those who were closely familiar with the changing fortunes of the Pacific war express astonishment at the failure of commentators (dealing with the current MacArthur-Defense argument) to mention the basic history of that part of World War II. After Pearl Harbor and for several years, MacArthur very naturally wanted Russia to throw her weight into the balance of a struggle that initially found Japan enjoying a great advantage. To MacArthur in 1942-43, lacking sufficient troops, the prospect of another big ally joining the fray against Japan was most attractive.

However, after the summer of 1944, when the U.S. defeated the Japanese fleet in the China Sea (thereby cutting off Japan from her sources of raw materials in southeast Asia), military opinion changed. Not only this big naval victory, but also the tremendous losses inflicted in Japan by our submarines gave American commanders in that area quite a new outlook. It is known that both intelligence services of Army and Navy felt that Japan was doomed. Military area specialists then thought that the political leaders of the Western Allies would take diplomatic steps to remove Japan from the war. Such specialists were disturbed in the months preceding Yalta to note that White House leaders did not see it the same way, and stuck to their idea that Russia should be brought in.

Military specialists at the time of Yalta actually began to work up a recommendation to the Chief of Staff advising against a deal to bring in Russia. (This action was described as "The Colonels' Report," reproduced in HUMAN EVENTS, April 2, 1955, from Senate Armed Service Committee Hearings of 1951.)

Revisionism: The inside story of how defenders of the official propaganda version of World War

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II sought to protect the Roosevelt-Truman administration exploded into print last week. It resulted in the dismissal of one State Department historian, Donald M. Dozer, and the retirement of another, Bryton Barron. Dozer claims he engaged in a "hassle" with his superiors about including in the publication a certain document of the Yalta proceedings which showed that Roosevelt insisted on having Alger Hiss attend the famous conference. Dispute also arose over inclusion of another memo showing that Roosevelt's Secretary of State, Edward Stettinius, wanted to make Joe Lash, left-wing student leader and protege of Mrs. Roosevelt, delegate to the San Francisco meeting of the UN in 1945. Lash's relations with Mrs. Roosevelt and his leftist history made headlines at various times during the last war.

Dozer says that he suffered most from another "hassle" he had with the Acheson crowd who ran the Historical Division — this one about a study of Senator McCarthy. In 1952, his superiors told him to perform a research job of "refuting" the Wisconsin Senator's charges that the State Department was infiltrated by Communists. Dozer was also asked by his superiors to "ghost" an article on "McCarthyism" to be published by *Harpers* magazine. Dozer flatly refused to do these two jobs.

These Dozer charges interest those about town who find in them confirmation of two privately but widely held opinions here: (1) that Alger Hiss, a man of no great talent, must have enjoyed favor from the highest echelon to rise so high in the bureaucracy and to play such a key role in conferences; and (2) that the bureaucracy is constantly utilized by "liberals" to provide data for their publications, even when such work is designed to attack members of the Legislative branch.

UN Decennial: A 10-year survey of the record of the United Nations which appeared in the Baltimore *Sun* this week has attracted some attention in Washington. The *Sun* editorially is pro-UN. The survey is written by its correspondent, Paul W. Ward, who has covered the UN since its inception a decade ago. Ward wastes no compliments on the international organization and is obviously skeptical of the alleged UN achievements.

In the concluding section of the survey, he writes that "it (the UN) has served mainly for the generalization of quarrels — for making every nation's business out of such disputes as the one between Indonesia and the Netherlands over West Irion, or the one between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. In the United National General Assembly, medieval Yemen has to take a stand on such things as the development of atomic energy, El Salvador on the disarmament differences of Moscow and Washington, and Iceland on the future of such East African territories as Somaliland." Ward notes that most delegates to the UN blink "the organization's capacity for spreading trouble around among otherwise disinterested countries."

The Most Exciting Presidential election since 1920 is ahead. Companies and individuals, now making up their Christmas gift lists, should give consideration to HUMAN EVENTS — a gift that will inspire a special thrill of appreciation 52 times a year. Two or more 3-month subscriptions, $2.50 each; two or more 6-month subscriptions, $5 each; two or more annual subscriptions, $9 each. A gift card, in your name, will accompany the first issue of the gift subscription. To make sure the card is properly inscribed, please indicate just how the inscription should read. A $60 order entitles you to a free bound and indexed volume of HUMAN EVENTS for 1955 (regular price, $15). Unless otherwise stated, the first issue — with your gift card — will be the December 17 issue reaching subscribers the week before Christmas. Order now; pay in January.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Pre-publication price *(only until December 31)* on 1955 BOUND ANNUAL VOLUME with complete index, $7.50. After January 1, $15. A few 1954 Bound Volumes are available at $15.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 43 HUMAN EVENTS October 29, 1955

Article Section

CONSERVATIVES, WAKE UP AND WIN! (I)

Your Activity NOW May Determine the Future of America

By JAMES L. WICK

This week's article will show that the free enterprise concept, during the last decade, has gained millions of supporters throughout the free world.

Next week's article will show, by case histories, that the American people are eager — when given a chance — to vote for honest attractive conservative candidates.

With Socialism now everywhere on the defensive, why — except for lack of effort — should the conservative cause lose in free enterprise America?

New Deal Republicans have made their plans to capture the 1956 convention. If they succeed, the American people will be offered their choice of two New Deal parties — which means no choice at all.

Conservatives have only 10 months in which to stop them. Their activity NOW may determine the future of America.

AT THE END of World War II, the trend in Europe toward socialism seemed irresistible.

Even the rich accepted the myth that the victory in World War II was won by a united anti-fascist front bound together by a common faith in Socialism and progressive ideas — the Soviets being included in that faith. That belief has now been exploded.

It was further thought that the defeated powers were a group of ultra-conservative and reactionary powers. Thinking people now know that Germany and Italy were examples of highly developed Socialism in the precise technical sense.

IN BRITAIN, as the war ended, the fashionable comment was that "our country is too poor to afford the luxury of Capitalism. We shall have to go Socialist."

In the British election of 1945, the Labor Party campaigned with slogans like "Fair Shares for all" and "The necessities for everybody before the luxuries for anybody."

But five years of experience with a Labor government was enough. Bitter cartoons in the British press were depicting the people of Germany — despite their own enormous reconstruction task — sending "Care" packages to their British cousins!

Out of office, the Socialists had promised abundance. In office, they had to glorify austerity. The voters — especially the women — called it quits. They concluded that their country was too poor to afford the luxury of Socialism.

GERMANY embraced Socialism in the 1880's. Bismarck, thinking Karl Marx had captured the hearts and minds of the working classes, introduced socialized medicine and other welfare measures to Germany. "We must give the masses what they want," said the Chancellor, hoping they in gratitude would allow the junker class to keep the reins of power. Except in the matter of race hatred, Bismarck was the spiritual grandfather of Adolf Hitler.

German socialization was abetted by militarism. The government, being the biggest customer of industry, had the power of life or death over almost all great industrial concerns. Tycoons learned that the first law of self-preservation was a discreet neutrality in politics; the political party they opposed one year might get into office the next year — and take revenge. Labor leaders, on the other hand,

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were free to fight for their political programs — and with better-than-even chances for success, for in a militaristic society, they met with only ineffectual and undercover resistance from the industrialists who had the greatest interest in opposing their proposals.

On account of Germany's background of Big Government, Big Industry and Big Labor, that country was expected to be the European country most likely to vote for Socialism after the war. To the world's amazement, however, the first German elections in 1948 gave decisive majorities to the German parties advocating free enterprise.

When that happened, one would expect that the United States, the symbol of Capitalism, would encourage German acceptance of free enterprise.

But our military government bureaucracy was packed with crypto-Socialists. Immediately after the election, the Voice of America answered the argument of the right-wing parties that the United States was a free enterprise country, by talking at length about government interventionism in America: TVA and other government-owned projects.

In addition, our officials — publicly as well as privately — reminded German leaders that the workers were already finding it difficult to buy food when the government was by decree holding prices down and warned that mass starvation would certainly occur when controls were lifted and prices went through the roof.* They said the German people — despite their hatred for the Soviet Union — would then in desperation turn to Communism.

To climax the New Deal effort, General Lucius Clay made his famous telephone call in June, 1948 to Adenauer's Economics Minister, Dr. Ludwig Erhard, forbidding him to decontrol the commodity markets — only to be calmly told by Erhard that no power on earth could stop it.

Again in 1950, after the invasion of South Korea, the U.S. occupation authorities issued an ultimatum to the Bonn government: it must embark upon a program of aggressive credit expansion — inflation — or be penalized by the blocking of Marshall aid counterpart funds. Again Erhard said "No!" Incredibly, the Germans rid themselves of the repressed inflation of National Socialism only in the teeth of fierce Allied opposition.

New Dealers have sought to credit the phenomenal German improvement to (1) the establishment of a stable currency; and (2) "the fact that Germans have always been hard workers."

It is certainly true that sound prosperity requires a sound currency. But that alone is not sufficient. The French occupation zone accepted the Adenauer monetary reform, but also sought to maintain the controlled economic system. Production leaped ahead in the decontrolled areas while stagnation continued in the French zone until it, too, decontrolled.

As for the Germans being "hard workers:" so are the French and the Italians when they have enough incentive to be hard workers — and their unions allow it. The truth is that the Germans were lethargic and indolent from 1945 to 1948 when the cigarette was the medium of exchange and controls of every kind discouraged enterprise. They went to work only when the combination of a sound currency and the abolition of controls gave them the necessary incentives.

The contrasting postwar experience of Great Britain and Germany has had profound effect upon European thinking. Socialism is no longer regarded as the wave of the future, despite the serious defects of European Capitalism, hamstrung as it is in most countries by a combination of monopoly industrialism and monopoly unionism. And the reaction in European countries has in turn made a powerful impression upon Americans returning from Europe who have reported to their communities.

ARGENTINA has just shown the American people what a Reuther-like demagog, in control of a nation's labor unions, can do to freedom.

Peron, a member of the military group that seized power in 1943, became chief of the secretariat of the Ministry of War and president of the National Labor Department. The latter was the lesser office, but Peron made it the stepping stone to dictatorship.

Searching for popular support, Peron began to cultivate labor leaders. Putting the power of government behind their organizing drives, he converted the weakest labor movement in South America into the strongest.

*Elliot Roosevelt predicted in 1946 that bread would shoot to $15 a loaf if U.S. price control were ended. Despite Elliot, price control was ended a few months later.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1944, after the ouster of Ramirez, titular head of the government, Peron moved into the Vice Presidency — increasing his ability to build the labor movement. He organized "The Labor Party" and in 1946 was elected President.

The Colonel demonstrated an uncanny aptitude for taking credit for each gain made by labor. Among his many techniques was one borrowed from Roosevelt. Under the U.S. Railway Labor law, if the contending parties reach an impasse, the President appoints an impartial arbitrator. Prior to the New Deal, the arbitrator's decision was regarded as final. Roosevelt, however, encouraged union leaders to make a direct appeal to him for still more. Roosevelt always found a way to get additional benefits for labor leaders who played ball with him.

Pupil Peron, however, outdid Teacher Roosevelt. For cooperating labor leaders, the Peron practice was to compel management to yield to every demand. Occasionally — just to demonstrate his enthusiasm for "shirtless ones" — he would order employers to give even more than labor had asked. Wages went up 50 and 100 per cent at a time. Workers got long vacations with pay and an extra month's pay at Christmas. The guaranteed annual wage came to Argentina several years before Reuther got to it. Workers could not be fired except after payment of huge indemnities — and even after that, a Peron grievance board might compel reinstatement.

Several Argentine labor leaders who risked their lives as well as careers to help Peron at critical moments during his upward climb thought they were entitled to the same gratitude from Peron that John L. Lewis expected from Roosevelt for his part in the election of 1936. In that year, the United Mine Workers made a $600,000 campaign loan when the party treasury was empty. The CIO of which Lewis was then President threw its entire organization into the drive to re-elect Roosevelt. But Lewis discovered after election that the deference expected was Lewis to Roosevelt, not the other way around.

Argentine labor leaders who objected to becoming puppets were lucky if they merely lost their jobs. Many also got jail sentences. Labor leaders who proved their loyalty were given supplemental positions with fat pay checks in the fast growing Ministry of Labor. Union membership became compulsory as a means of assuring obey-or-starve power over all workers.

Though Argentina's population was only 19 million, the membership of CGT, the General Confederation of Labor, grew to 6 million. On a comparable basis, union membership in the United States (now 16 million) would be 45 million.

The violence to which Reuther's union has resorted in Kohler, Wisconsin and Newcastle, Indiana was put to its ultimate use in Argentina.

Whenever Peron's power was endangered, the CGT paralyzed the threatening sector. One of the world's greatest newspapers, *La Prensa,* was consistently critical of Peron. Striking newspaper unions closed it down. Peron turned the newspaper over to the CGT. The point was not lost upon other newspapers and corporations.

Like Reuther, Peron regarded capitalism as obsolete. The Argentine dictator, like Reuther, loved to create beautiful blueprints promising to make everybody — especially the originator — happy. Reuther's plan is to put every industry under the direction of an Industry Council — with labor representation, of course. Each industry would be required to produce its share of employment and goods — as determined by a National Production Board. Wages and fringe benefits would be determined for the purpose of creating the purchasing power necessary to absorb all of industry's production. For the moment, this plan is in Reuther's icebox, but he will undoubtedly bring it out as soon as he gets enough Reuther puppets into the federal government.

The Peron plan provided for the systematic take-over of all enterprises by the employees. As a beginning, Peron passed a law fixing legal profits at 5 per cent. Excess profits were to be placed in a special fund to buy shares for the workers. The process was to continue until all shares were owned by the employees.

Plainly, investors and managers found Peron distasteful. But how much benefit was derived by the shirtless ones — for whom Peron "out of his great love risked the wrath of the oligarchs?" Let us see.

Hundreds of millions of dollars in gold rolled into Argentina as a result of two World Wars she stayed out of; as a consequence, after the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accession to power of the friend of the shirtless, labor's rank and file had a short period of happiness. The wage increases seemed like manna from heaven, something coming exclusively out of extortionate profits.

But Peron's controls of prices and profits soon took their toll. The rate of production could not keep pace with the rate of wage increases. Before long, for the first time in history, "meatless days" came to the world's greatest cattle-producing country, where meat had always been the cheapest of foods. The richest of the Latin American countries had the greatest inflation.

Despite sensational benefits "on paper" for the masses, they became tragic losers. Only Peron and the Argentine Walter Reuthers were the gainers. Now they too have lost.

COMMUNISM: Ten, fifteen and twenty years ago, it was popular to believe that Communists were akin to the early Christian martyrs and that Stalin was a peace-loving democrat. Coming home from Yalta, Roosevelt smeared critics of Russia as agents or puppets of Doctor Goebbels. As late as 1948, Truman, referring to Stalin, said "I like Old Joe."

Eggheads (like James Wechsler of the New York *Post*) seek to convince the American people that Communism abroad is the enemy rather than Communism at home. Their rationalization is clear. The ADA legislative program for America is almost word for word the *Daily Worker's* legislative program for America.

Communism's domestic program is national planning. The premise is that the masses are incapable of taking care of themselves. The government must take care of them; it must take away in taxes a large part of their earnings and spend it in their behalf.

In contrast, conservatives believe in the Judeo-Christian concept of individual responsibility. They believe that for better or for worse, Americans have a right to live their own lives and spend their own money.

The conflict between the New Deal-Socialist-Communist attitude and the conservative-libertarian was dramatized when during a visit to Moscow University — as leader of a group of American editors — I asked G. D. Vovchenko, the university's vice president:

"Most Americans believe there is no freedom in Russia. How do you answer such a charge?"

Vovchenko replied: "You have the situation reversed. It is you Americans who have no freedom. Your industries are owned by big capitalists. The masses in your country are at the mercy of the exploiters, of Wall Street.

"It is the opposite in the Soviet Union. The people own everything; they own the factories and the farms. The government thinks only of their welfare and the government is their government. Our people are free. Your people are not free."

Any reader of the columns of Eleanor Roosevelt and Drew Pearson, of the speeches of Kefauver, Lehman, Humphrey and Co. will recognize elements of similarity between their thinking and Vovchenko's. They think, as do the Soviets, that government ownership is synonymous with people's ownership. They think private ownership is suspect. They think, as do the Soviets, that government is a Great White Father, eager to provide the good things of life if the people will only turn over their earnings to the beneficent bureaucrats.

Ten, fifteen and twenty years ago, it was easy for better minds than Pearson's and Eleanor's to think that way. But today with increasing recognition that Bigger and Bigger Government can have only one ending — Communism — why should conservatives allow a group of cynical New Deal Republicans to take their party away from them?

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

James L. Wick is executive publisher of HUMAN EVENTS. He was national defense specialist for the Republican National Committee in 1940 and was a member of Governor Dewey's research staff in 1944. He is the author of a book analyzing the 1940, 1944 and 1948 campaigns — appropriately titled: "How NOT to Run for President, a Handbook for Republicans."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED